

A Discourse-based Approach to Literature: An Extended Review of G. Cook (1994)

Guy Cook. *Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994.
vii + 285 pp. (ISBN 0194371859), pbk.

Laura HIDALGO

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

0. INTRODUCTION

The discussion of the notion of 'literariness' has given rise to the production of an extensive body of work in recent decades, in particular since the structuralist claim that certain linguistic features, such as parallelism, are closely related to the presence of a 'poetic function' in texts (see Jakobson 1960). Although this view has generally been discarded, the controversy regarding the nature of 'literariness' is still open and focuses on questions such as to what extent linguistic choice conditions literary effect (Halliday 1973), whether literariness might not really be a property of texts at all, but a matter of social conventions (see Petrey 1990), or even, whether, rather, it regards the reader, as is claimed in schema theory and reader-response theory.

Cook's (1994) *Discourse and Literature* enters this forum in an attempt to bring together apparently diverging trends: on the one hand, those of stylistic formal analysis in the Jakobsonian tradition and, on the other, schema theory, inspired mainly in work in Artificial Intelligence, more particularly in Schank and Abelson (1977). Although work has been done previously in the interpretation of literariness in terms of schema theory (see de Beaugrande 1987), most of the research has focused on the analysis of chronological sequences in narratives, also called *story-grammars* (van Dijk 1982). In this sense, the theory of literariness put forward by Cook is groundbreaking in that it is the first serious endeavour in studies of literature to encompass rigorous linguistic analysis within a broader cognitive framework. From this perspective, it belongs in a current trend of theoretical and applied linguistics which seeks a more complete

understanding of text and discourse through interdisciplinary approaches to linguistic description.¹

Cook's proposal develops from the idea that literature does have a specific function that differentiates it from other discourse types. This, however, is neither the structuralists' poetic function, nor any of the other functions standardly mentioned in linguistic theories. More precisely, he makes reference to the Hallidayan (1994) distinction between the interpersonal and the ideational functional components of any text in context. According to Cook (*ibid.*:38), literature cannot be associated exclusively with either of these two functions in isolation, but rather with a third function that should be added to existing classifications and which he calls the function of 'cognitive change' (*ibid.*:44). In his view, it is the function of certain texts to challenge and alter existing schemata in the reader, and literary texts typically carry out this function. The challenging of a reader's schemata at higher processing levels is usually accompanied by deviation at the linguistic-structural level, which shows the need to incorporate formal linguistic analysis in this type of approach. The whole phenomenon by which text deviation is related to the challenging of schemata in the reader he defines as 'discourse deviation' (*ibid.*:182).

The book is divided into two parts. The first part is a comprehensive review of work carried out in fields relevant to his theoretical proposal, and covers chapters 1 to 6. Chapter 1 is an introduction to the main issues in schema theory from a general historical perspective. Chapter 2 is a review of work done in discourse analysis, in particular the notion of 'function' in different authors and of pragmatic approaches to the study of texts in general and literature in particular. Chapter 3 is a detailed analysis of Artificial Intelligence approaches to text processing, with particular emphasis on Schank and Abelson (1977). The theoretical issues discussed in this chapter are applied to the analysis of two texts in chapter 4. Chapter 5 is a review of literary theories from formalism to stylistics, focusing on the notion of 'defamiliarisation'. Chapter 6 again is a practical section where the author analyses two texts, an advertisement and a poem, from a perspective that combines linguistic formal analysis and schema theory as explained in the previous chapters. Part 2 covers chapters 7 to 9, which deal with Cook's theory of discourse deviation (chapter 7), its application to three literary texts (chapter 8) and finally, a discussion of the implications for the teaching of literature (chapter 9).

This extended review will consider some of the relevant issues dealt with by Cook (1994) with regard to the notion of literariness, and will discuss the

contributions that this framework offers to previous work in the fields of discourse and text analysis.

1. DISCOURSE APPROACHES TO LITERATURE

Cook's theory is firmly grounded in the systemic-functional tradition, in the sense that it acknowledges the importance of communication as a social act. What distinguishes his model from other discourse theories (Halliday, 1973, 1978, 1994) is the emphasis on the role of the reader, for it is precisely the relationship between readers' knowledge and text that establishes the grounds for the function of 'cognitive change', which in Cook's framework is assigned to literature and which is one of his most significant contributions to previous theories of literariness.

1.1. Pragmatic approaches to literature

The author considers both discourse and pragmatic theories to be inadequate for the interpretation of literature because of their failure to account for the role of the reader/receiver, since they tend to concentrate on the social context or on inference procedures which focus on the speaker/sender (*op.cit.* chapter 2). The author also criticises both pragmatic and discourse theories because of their inadequacies in dealing with conflictive communication, which is a central aspect of much literary discourse. I would like to analyse these points in some detail.

With regard to the first point, although it is true that current pragmatic theories do not deal with the reader, in my opinion there are certain aspects of pragmatic theory that are necessary for any complete interpretation of discourse, namely, the Principles of Co-operation and of Relevance, in addition to Coherence.² I take these principles to be necessary elements in the process of communication, but not necessarily the only points of reference for a theory of communication, as is claimed for example by Sperber and Wilson (1986) with regard to the Principle of Relevance.

In my view, in his discussion of these issues, Cook fails to distinguish two different facets of the pragmatics-literature interface: on the one hand, the implications of an approach to the analysis of literary texts which uses pragmatic principles as an instrument of textual analysis; and on the other, a pragmatic approach to literature as discourse, which concerns the question of the status of literature as a discourse type. Cook (*ibid.*:40-45) considers only the second of

these options, and consequently overlooks the possibility of explaining linguistic deviation not only in structural terms but also in pragmatic terms, as is done in certain types of stylistic analysis.³

1.2. Literature and the Co-operative Principle

With regard to pragmatic approaches to the status of literature as discourse, on the other hand, he is right to observe that literature cannot be explained in terms of the Co-operative Principle or the Politeness Principle alone. Here, however, I would like to make two points: first, attempts *have* been made to explain literature in terms of the Co-operative Principle, and in this sense Pratt's (1977) work *Towards a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*, has been particularly influential.⁴

The second point is that although Cook claims that in literary communication the Co-operative and Politeness Principles are suspended, I would say this is so only as far as the Politeness Principle is concerned. Literature, like any other type of discourse, involves the notion of co-operation, inasmuch as there is an author interested in having a public who will read his or her works and inasmuch as there are readers willing to do so. As Pavel (1986:72) points out, this is a pragmatic question which concerns precisely the extent to which literariness is defined by convention and the role that literature plays in our society. In this view, co-operation is present, but it does not follow the standard procedures, if by this we understand those of non-literary discourse.

This claim is also present, although from a different perspective, in works such as Bateson (1972) and Iser (1989), unfortunately not mentioned by Cook. Bateson studied in depth the characteristics of the 'metamessage' *this is play* which he observed to be present in activities such as play, joking and fiction and which distinguish them from 'serious' acts, such as 'threat' and 'insult'. Iser's (1989) view of fiction is that it is a 'playground' where author and reader are the players, again focusing on a very particular kind of communication and co-operation. The distinction between the two levels of the message itself and the metamessage 'this is play' or 'this is fiction' fits well, in my opinion, with Cook's own theory of discourse deviation, since Cook himself makes a distinction between the discourse level, which is related to his notion of context, and the textual level, which corresponds to the linguistic structural configuration of text.

In brief, although Cook in this work acknowledges the importance of the main principles of discourse analysis, he considers that a discourse approach to literature needs to be complemented by means of a theory which will give more

prominence to the reader and to the stored knowledge that is activated through reading. In his view, such a theory is schema theory, which he reviews in chapters 1, 3 and 4 and which I will analyse in the following section.

2. SCHEMA THEORY AS A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO LITERARY DISCOURSE

As has been pointed out by many authors, the notion of 'schema' is a notoriously vague concept. However, this does not prevent it from being an important notion in different fields ranging from psychology (Bateson, 1972), anthropology (Goffman, 1974), sociolinguistics (Tannen, 1993), semantics (Fillmore, 1986), second language teaching (Carrell et al., 1988, Hatch, 1992), literature (van Dijk 1982, de Beaugrande, 1987, Semino, 1995) and, of course, cognitive linguistics (Langacker 1987, Lakoff 1989, Werth 1996) and Artificial Intelligence (Schank and Abelson, 1977, Schank 1982).

The author takes up the view of schemata as «mental representations ... [that] are used in discourse processing to predict and make sense of the particular instance which the discourse describes» (Cook *ibid.*:11). The notion of schema is closely related to the notions of 'expectation', 'norm' and 'deviation', in the sense that every individual occurrence encountered by a speaker/reader is mapped against the stereotyped version stored in memory and compared. As I will discuss below, these notions set the grounds for Cook's (*ibid.*:191) own classification of schema types according to the effect discourse has on the reading process. Before describing this phenomenon, I will consider those aspects that Cook uses as a point of departure for his own theory.

2.1. Schema theory and discourse analysis as complementary disciplines

Cook (*op.cit.*) devotes chapters 1,3, and 4 to a long review of AI approaches to text processing together with an application to the analysis of two texts. While some of the points discussed would have benefited from the use of more examples, the argumentation itself is a logical development of a dynamic approach to text processing taking Schank and Abelson (1977) as a point of departure. According to Cook, the shortcomings of schema theory, in particular its lack of interest in form and its failure to account for default elements, can be compensated for by the incorporation of schema theory into a theory of discourse.

For this reason, Cook's proposal of combining it with structural linguistic analysis makes sense and sets the grounds for potentially interesting research.

2.2. The notion of a hierarchy of schemata

Considering now the contributions that schema theory can make to a theory of literariness, Cook points out that schema theory provides the means of integrating the reader in a theory of literary discourse, thus complementing text centred approaches. This is particularly necessary when coherence is not signalled by cohesion or is pragmatically inferred (Cook, *ibid.*:125). Here, the notion of a hierarchy of schemata is particularly significant:

human understanding (...) can be represented as a hierarchy of levels of schemata in which failure to understand at one level can be referred to the level above. (1994:80)

Cook develops the idea of a hierarchy of schemata by establishing three different types corresponding to the processing levels involved: 'language schemata', which operate at the lexico-grammatical level, 'text schemata', which are concerned with the rhetorical structures of the text, and 'world schemata', which involve knowledge of the world and of discourse-contextual factors.

The possibility of a hierarchy of schemata is particularly useful as a potential means of explaining conflictive texts, as there will always be the possibility of interpreting the breaking of rules at the textual level as being purposeful at the discourse level. One of the examples provided by Cook (*ibid.*:148-49) is Buñuel's *Le Charme Discret de la Bourgeoisie*, whose chaotic and apparently incoherent structure as text can be interpreted at a higher level as a «rejection of hierarchies of characters in traditional stories and of hierarchies of people in general, as well as a rejection of coherence» (*ibid.*:149).

The advantages of an approach of this kind as compared to one based on the notion of conversational implicature recovered at a higher level (Pratt 1977) is that it allows for a more detailed and systematic analysis of the interpretation process, precisely by providing a means of systematising the knowledge that is activated in the reader and its interaction with the text itself.

2.3. Schemata and discourse types

One important point made by Cook with regard to the potentiality of schema theory in literary interpretation is the fact that while certain stylistic features

undoubtedly distinguish specific texts as unique, it is also true that the mental representations that accompany the written material are often as important as the language itself. This he claims can be observed by the fact that many good works survive translation. He explains this by pointing out that even if the linguistic structure might have been altered to some extent, the schemata regarding plot, characters and the connections to the real world (Cook's world schemata) are kept virtually unchanged. In order to prove this claim, Cook provides an analysis in terms of Schank and Abelson's (1977) model of the opening lines of Dostoyevski's *Crime and Punishment*. Additionally, and again by applying the same type of analysis to an advertisement, he concludes that the relation between the schemata evoked by the advertisement and the world schemata is different from the relation between these same elements in the case of the Dostoyevski extract.

Although the type of analysis itself is uninteresting from the point of view of analytical and interpretive procedures - mainly because of the inadequacies of the Schank and Abelson model for the interpretation of literature and not because of the use Cook makes of it - he does make the point that different types of discourse can be distinguished to some extent by analysing connections between schemata. I shall proceed to consider the way in which Cook elaborates this material into his own theory of schemata and discourse deviation, which greatly improves the analytical and interpretive potential of the Schank and Abelson model applied to literary texts; but first, I will consider the aspects he takes from formalism and which he incorporates into his proposal.

3. THE NOTIONS OF DEVIATION AND DEFAMILIARISATION IN FORMALIST THEORIES OF LITERARINESS

The failure to account for linguistic form by means of schema theory is however the focus of other theories of literariness which Cook deals with under the heading of 'formalism' and 'stylistics' (op.cit. chapter 5). Here he takes up the formalist and structuralist tradition (see Mukarowski 1964 and Jakobson 1960) whose principles developed into a broader theory of literary discourse generally referred to as stylistics (see Widdowson 1977 and 1992, Carter 1982, Leech and Short 1981, Carter and Simpson 1989). It is this type of approach to literature which views literariness as a deviation from a norm that can be observed by rigorous linguistic analysis and which is partly incorporated into Cook's theory.

The author draws attention to the relationship that can be established between this theory and schema theory, since both deal with expectations as the norm:

«schemata are expectations, and the essence of schema theory is that discourse proceeds, and achieves coherence, by successfully locating the unexpected within a framework of expectation» (ibid.:130). There is also a close connection between Cook's notion of cognitive change and the structuralist notion of *defamiliarisation*, which is related to the idea «that the function of literature is to restore freshness to perception which has become habitual and automated: to make things strange, to make us see them anew» (Cook, ibid.:131).⁵

3.1. The notion of 'deviation' redefined

Although the author acknowledges the criticisms ⁶ to the Jakobsonian claim that literariness can be related to the presence of linguistic features in a text, he rightly points out that Jakobson's (1960) notion of *poetic function* has been largely misunderstood, and that the Jakobsonian type of analysis should not be discarded but rather used as a point of departure in stylistic analysis. In this sense, Cook makes a point of considering 'everyday language' as the 'norm' from which literature deviates, and uses several advertisements as examples of texts which might be structurally deviant but which do not present the function of cognitive change typical of literature. While this is a logical development of structuralist principles, Cook's theory, as a discourse theory, goes beyond structuralism, which he criticises mainly for its failure to assign further meaning to structural deviation, as it concentrates on variations within the structural system without considering repercussions outside it. Interestingly, in Cook's view the notion of defamiliarisation is at odds with the isolation of the text, since this phenomenon depends so much on the reader's psychology and the socio-historical context (ibid.:139). This higher-level meaning can be accounted for by combining schema theory and linguistic analysis, in a way he proposes in part 2 of his book and which I will analyse in the following section.

4. COOK'S (1994) THEORY OF LITERARINESS AS DISCOURSE DEVIATION

Cook's (1994) theory of literariness as discourse deviation is based on the incorporation of schema theory to a theory of literary discourse grounded on the notion of defamiliarization. He defines it «as dynamic interaction between linguistic and text-structural form on the one hand, and schematic representations of the world on the other, whose overall result is to bring about a change in the

schemata of the reader» (Cook, *ibid.*:182). This effect of schema change (cognitive change) is what Cook claims to be characteristic of literature - though it does not mean that all literature is schema-changing - and that this challenging function is related to the fact that literature does not have an overt practical or social purpose. This makes it possible to accept challenges to our value systems which in other discourse types would be too threatening. The types of change that can take place are classified by Cook under the heading of 'schema disrupting' discourse, which he contrasts with other discourse types (such as the advertisements he uses as examples) that are 'schema reinforcing' or 'schema preserving' (*ibid.*:191). By this he means discourse types that reinforce or preserve schemata which form part of our accepted everyday socio-cultural environment. On the other hand, schema disrupting discourse - which is also labelled as 'schema refreshing' - can effect changes on the reader by destroying existing schemata, constructing new ones, or establishing new connections.

4.1. Schema refreshment and the function of 'cognitive change' in literature

As part of a process, schema refreshment is dynamic, otherwise it would not be possible to claim that a reader's schemata can be challenged and altered as a result of interaction. Consequently, it involves making use of a dynamic notion of schemata which diverges from the static model used in Artificial Intelligence theories and, possibly, in some discourse theories.⁷ Here, however, Cook should acknowledge that there are previous frameworks based on a dynamic notion of schemata, although obviously different from his own theory (see Goffman, 1972, Tannen, 1993, and also Werth, 1996).

The notion of schema refreshment is relative and depends on personal and socio-historical variables among others. For example, what may be deviant and schema refreshing for one reader might not be so for another. This phenomenon is especially interesting in the case of texts whose status as literature is questioned, as is the case of the Bond poem he uses as one of his examples (*ibid.*167-173). Here, a reader's rejection of the work as a poem might be regarded as further proof of its challenging power and of the presence of a deviation which, however, is felt to be too disruptive by a particular reader. Moreover, because readers belong to specific socio-historical situations, the process is time-variable, so that a text which at one time was schema refreshing might not be so any longer. On this, Cook (*ibid.*:194) observes that «this tendency of new form and content to become not only accepted but conventional, leads to a lack of fit between the literary canon and the category of 'schema-refreshing discourse'».

The concepts of schema refreshment and cognitive change are intuitively felt to be necessary categories in the understanding of literary discourse, and their creation is one of the merits of the model under discussion. However, the notions are also problematic because of the empirical difficulties in proving that they actually take place, an aspect that is discussed further in section 4.3. below.

4.2. The process of discourse deviation defined

As mentioned above, the process of discourse deviation involves a dynamic interaction between linguistic features and a reader's mental representations or schemata. Cook describes the process in the following way (ibid.:201):

A reader's feeling that the text structure or linguistic choices of a given discourse are normal or deviant derives from a comparison of its text structure (T) and its language (L) with the reader's pre-existing text schemata S(T) and language schemata S(L). The interaction of these interactions creates an illusion of a 'world' in the discourse (W), which can be compared with the world schemata of the reader.

The process thus takes place continuously while reading, with the consequence of schemata being constantly updated. Discourse deviation may take place in connection with deviations at the linguistic structural levels, but this is not necessarily so. As an illustration of this, Cook (op.cit. chapter 8) carries out a detailed analysis of three different texts (W.Blake's poem *The Tyger*, H.James's novella *The Turn of the Screw* and G.M. Hopkins's *The Windhover*). According to the deviations found at each of the levels, the three texts can be described as presenting the following features (where S stands for 'world schemata', T for 'text schemata' and L for 'language schemata'; the - sign stand for 'deviant', while the + sign stands for 'not deviant'):

1. The Tyger: S-, T+, L-
2. The Turn of the Screw: S-, T-, L+
3. The Windhover: S-, T-, L-

The three texts are schema-refreshing, in that they disrupt a potential reader's world schemata. However, in the case of *The Tyger*, this is associated with deviant lexico-grammatical forms (L-) within a conventional ballad form (T+); in the case of the *Turn of the Screw*, it is associated with deviant text structure (T-) related to manipulation of unreliable narrators; and in *The Windhover*, it is accompanied by deviation at both levels simultaneously.

4.3. Problems in the application of the model

In spite of the high quality and interest of the model under discussion, there are certain aspects that prove to be problematic in its application to the interpretation of specific text types. The first problem arises with regard to the definition of 'deviation', a traditionally problematic concept. As has been pointed out above, both deviation and schema refreshment are relative concepts, since they depend on variables such as reader differences, time and cultural variation and different genre conventions. Variations of this kind necessarily lead to difficulties in the identification of what might be deviant or not. Cook (ibid.200-201) gives two examples of text types which yield paradoxical interpretations, precisely because of conflicts arising in the variations mentioned above. One of the examples is the Bond poem mentioned in section 4.1.. According to Cook (ibid.200), this poem is deviant only from the point of view of the world schemata evoked, which defeat the reader's expectations regarding assumptions about World War I. In his view, both the language and the structure of the poem are «markedly unliterary» (ibid.168), especially with regard to the lexis, which is typical of everyday language. This obviously leads to the problem of how to define as literary a text which seems to be clearly 'unliterary'. The possibility mentioned by Cook (ibid.) is to adduce pragmatic questions such as the fact that the text is considered to be literary by convention, but this fails to account for the relation between these conventions and the way language is actually used in the text.

In point of fact, it could be argued that the reason for some readers to reject this poem as poetry is not only related to defeated expectations regarding the treatment of the content as connected to world schemata, but also because it defeats expectations with regard to what is assumed to be 'poetic language', which concerns text and language schemata too. According to this view, the use of ordinary language in poetry, which is typical of the second half of the XX century, can be seen as a deviation from earlier canonical poetry, including the World War I poets themselves. It can also be seen as a deviation from what is assumed to be 'standard poetic language' for readers not familiarised with the more recent conventions of contemporary poetry. The question here is whether such use is still schema refreshing or whether it has become incorporated into the canon.

While here we face a paradox of difficult solution, it should be possible to establish a clearer relation between genre conventions and processing levels. In my opinion, the lower levels should operate within the rules imposed by the higher levels. For example, the Bond poem mentioned above can be considered to present deviant language, not because it deviates from ordinary language and

lexis, but because it deviates from what is expected to be 'poetic language' as explained above.

Finally, a further problem arises in the definition of schema refreshment, since, as Semino (1995:104) points out, «schema change is not only infrequent but also hard to verify». Semino (*ibid.*) suggests a partial redefinition of the notion of schema refreshment in order for it to cover not only radical changes in schemata but also less dramatic experiences, which might involve only a challenge or the establishment of new connections between existing schemata. This would enable the framework to account for less obviously deviant examples as those used by the author.

4.4. Applications to teaching

The final section of the volume under review is devoted to a brief consideration of the implications of the present theory to the teaching of literature. The author observes the shift in emphasis that has taken place in recent approaches from bottom-up to top-down processing, and criticises the implied beliefs that bottom-up processing modes necessarily involve old-fashioned, authoritarian teaching methods, while top-down modes are viewed as more progressive⁸. The author stresses the importance of combining both innovation and conservation of old patterns, of interest in form and focus on literature as experience. In this sense this theory fits in well with an approach to the teaching of literature whose objective is to combine formal linguistic analysis and higher level processing modes with a respect for individual interpretation and expression.

5. CONCLUSION

Considering now Cook (1994) in general terms, his theory is an important contribution to discourse theories of literariness, and consequently can be the point of departure for potentially interesting research in this field.⁹ As a dynamic model, it seems to me that it offers an extremely convincing approach to literary communication as conflictive and problematic, an aspect that tends to be kept in the background of other theories, where the emphasis is on successful communication. This compensates for the problems involved in an approach based on the notions of deviation and schema change (see section 4.3. above).

There are many aspects that need systematisation and more rigorous explanation, not only in Cook's (1994) framework, but in discourse-pragmatic

and stylistics theories in general. For a start, some consensus needs to be reached regarding the terminological differences which are often confusing and misleading in the literature. Furthermore, 'schemata' (and the other related terms) need to be given more rigorous definitions, both as categories and as elements that carry out a function in discourse. It is also necessary to specify how schemata are actually to be incorporated into a theory of discourse and how some discourse-pragmatic principles, such as Relevance, would interact with knowledge processing as described by schema theory.

It is important, however, to distinguish between this need to elaborate more explicit and systematic principles for a theory of discourse that can be applied to the analysis and interpretation of literary texts, and the fact that this type of analysis, however rigorous, will always remain intuitive to some degree. Cook (1994) points out several times throughout his discussion and analysis that the interpretations he offers are by no means the only ones, and that the categories he proposes are «both uncertain and open-ended» (ibid.:95). Although for some critics, theories should not be devised in order to prove an intuition, it seems to me that such a view represents an extremely radical position which overlooks the fact that many scientific theories work in this way. As Cook says, we need both creativity and rigorous work in combination.

Consideration of these points and the comments made in previous sections, leads me to conclude that Cook (1994) is a book that will appeal to teachers and researchers in the fields of linguistics and literary theory. It is particularly useful as a theoretical introduction to work in linguistic approaches to literariness and as a practical guide and model for text analysis and interpretation.

NOTES

¹ See, for example, Tannen (1993) for a collection of papers where frame theory is applied to the analysis of different text types, from a psychiatric session to sociolinguistic interviews; Carrell et al (1988) for integrated approaches to ESL methodology; Sell and Vedonk (1994) for interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis of literature.

² See Werth (1996) for a detailed account of how these Principles are incorporated into a discourse grammar framework.

³ See for example Simpson (1989) for a stylistic analysis of dramatic dialogue in terms of Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson 1987).

⁴ Pratt's (1977) theory is based on an application of Grice's maxims (Grice 1975) to literary discourse. She claims that irony, for example, which constitutes a violation of the maxim of quality (be truthful) within the text, at a higher processing level is interpreted as a conversational implicature. This enables the reader to recover the intended meaning.

⁵ For a recent discussion of the notion of *defamiliarization* in text interpretation see Miall and Kuiken 1994.

⁶ See for example Werth (1976) for the first fully argued rejection of the claim that literary texts present linguistic features that distinguish them from other non-literary texts.

⁷ Cook's view of the reading process as dynamic is partly inspired by Schank (1982).

⁸ However, there is work that suggests a combination of approaches, as in Carrell et al. (1988).

⁹ See for example Semino (1995) for an application of this theory to text worlds in poetry.

Departamento de Filología Inglesa
 Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
 Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
 Carretera de Colmenar, km. 15
 28049 Madrid
 email: l.hidalgo@cc.uam3.sdi.uam.es

REFERENCES

- Bateson, G. (1972). A theory of play and fantasy. In G. Bateson (ed) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. London: Intertext Books, 177-193.
- Beaugrande, R. de (1987). Schemas for literary communication. In L. Halász (ed) *Literary Discourse*. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter. 48-72.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. et al. (eds.) (1988). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. (ed.) (1982). *Language and Literature*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Carter R. and P. Simpson (eds.) (1989). *Language, Discourse and Literature*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) (1982). *New Developments in Cognitive Models of Discourse Processing* (special issue of *Text* 2-1/3). Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Fillmore, C. (1986). Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica* VI 2, 222-253.
- Grice H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation in Cole and Morgan (eds) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3: Speech Acts. London: Academic Press. 40-58.
- Goffman E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Halliday M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Arnold.
- (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Arnold.
- (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, second edition. London: Arnold.

- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iser, W. (1989). The play of the text in Budick and Iser (eds.) *Languages of the Unsayable*. New York/Oxford: Columbia University Press. 325-339.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics in T. Sebeok (ed) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 350-377.
- Lakoff G. (1989). Some empirical results about the nature of concepts. In *Mind and Language* 4, 1 & 2. 103-129.
- Langacker R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol.1, Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Leech G. & Short M. (1981) *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.
- Miall D. S. and D. Kuiken (1994). Beyond text theory: Understanding literary response in *Discourse Processes* 17, 337-352.
- Mukarovsky, J. (1964). Standard language and poetic language in Paul L. Garvin (ed) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*. Translation. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 17-30.
- Pavel, T. (1986). *Fictional Worlds*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Petrey, S. (1990). *Speech Acts and Literary Theory*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Pratt, M. L. (1977). *Towards a Speech Act theory of Literary Discourse*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Schank, R. C. (1982). *Dynamic Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schank, R. C. and R. Abelson (1977). *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sell R. and P. Verdonk (eds.) (1994). *Literature and the New Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi B. V.
- Semino, E. (1995). Schema theory and the analysis of text worlds in poetry. In *Language and Literature* 4, 2. 79-108.
- Simpson, P. (1989). Politeness phenomena in Ionesco's. *The Lesson* in Carter and Simpson (eds.). 171-194.
- Sperber, D. & D. Wilson (1986). *Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (ed.) (1993). *Framing in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Werth, P. (1976). Roman Jakobson's verbal analysis of poetry. *Journal of Linguistics* 12, 21-73.
- (1996). *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Widdowson, H. (1977). *Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature*. London: Longman.
- (1992). *Practical Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.